

REMARKS

In the claims:

Claims 1-20 were present in the application.

Claims 1, 6-10 and 16-19 stand withdrawn from consideration.

In regard to these claims standing withdrawn, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration .

Claim 15 has been canceled in order to advance the application.

Claim 20 has been amended.

Claims 2-5 and 11-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

In the office action, claims 2-5 and 11-15 have been rejected under 35 USC § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Magee (5644431) in view of Sandor et al. (5330799).

The Applicant submits that the invention of the Applicant's claims 2-5, and 11-14, are distinguishable over the cited Magee (5644431) in view of Sandor (5330799) references as follows:

In regards to the Magee citation, most importantly, the process of Sandor is NOT compatible with the process mentioned in Magee, in that Magee FIRST forms a lens material, and afterwards this lens sheet may be printed; whereas Sandor FIRST prints his film, and then forms polymer lenses on his printed film. Magee does NOT show printing first.

Also, the prior art references do not contain any suggestion (express or implied) that they be combined, or that they be combined in the manner suggested.

In addition, each reference is complete and functional in itself, so there would be no reason to use parts from or add or substitute parts from any reference.

Therefore, Magee does NOT provide the guidance whereby a person having ordinary skill in the art would reasonably combine these teachings.

Additional Responses re: each claim:

In addition to NOT being able to reasonably combine the teaching of Magee with

Sandor, in reference to Applicant's claim 2:

Furthermore, the process in the Applicant's cl. 2 is distinctly different from the Sandor process in that the alignment method of the Applicant's claim 2 is NOT in Sandor.

Sandor FIRST PRINTS his image,- then Sandor aligns polymer lenslets to "A"single register line at the edge of the substrate using a sensor.

The Applicant, in cl.2, FIRST embosses optical ridges into a film, NEXT, relies on a precise cutting of the film edge parallel to said optical ridges; NEXT, uses the edge guide of the printing press to keep the optical ridges parallel to the edge guide, Next, sets the indicia lines of the printing plates parallel to the edge guide, so that the subsequent print line indicia in the final step are printed parallel to the film edge and therefore parallel to the embossed ridges.

In response to the citation of Sandor "(see step 84; col. 14, lines 28-30 and figure 10)":

Sandor mentions cutting/slitting/trimming the lenticular sheet ONLY after: Sandor's roll film has been printed, an alignment step, and the lens applied; NOT as a method of aligning print to to embossed film. Thereby Sandor's 'cutting/slitting/trimming' is only a generic finishing operation irrelevant to the process of aligning optical ridges to print of the Applicant's claim.

Therefore, the combination of the Magee and Sandor references would NOT yield the Applicant's invention.

In addition to NOT being able to reasonably combine the teaching of Magee with Sandor, in reference to Applicant's claim 3:

Applicant's claim 3 is dependent on claim 2. The process in the Applicant's dependent cl. 3 is distinctly different from the Sandor process in that the alignment method of the Applicant's independent claim 2, as described in reference to Applicant's claim 2 (above), is NOT in Sandor.

The dependent claim adds additional novel features and thus are submitted to be a-fortiori patentable. Herein, the Applicant cites further specifics of alignment for sheet printing in claim 3: The Applicant describes specifically cutting the film at right angles, and subsequent alignment with the edge guide and gripper bar of sheet fed presses. This results in achieving alignment of print indicia lines parallel to the embossed optical ridges

Sandor mentions cutting/slitting/trimming the lenticular sheet ONLY after Sandor's roll film has been printed, an alignment step, and the lens applied; NOT as a method of aligning print to to embossed film.

Thereby Sandor's 'cutting/slitting/trimming' is only a generic finishing operation irrelevant to the process of aligning optical ridges to print of the Applicant's claim.

Therefore, the combination of the Magee and Sandor references would NOT yield the Applicant's invention.

In addition to NOT being able to reasonably combine the teaching of Magee with Sandor, in reference to Applicant's claim 4:

The process in the Applicant's cl. 4 is distinctly different from the Sandor process in that the alignment method of the Applicant's claim 4 is NOT in Sandor.

Herein, the process in the Applicant's cl. 4 is distinctly different from the Sandor process in that the alignment method of the Applicant's claim 4 is NOT in Sandor.

The Applicant's sensory device FIRST senses the lenses ridge pattern in order to NEXT align the Applicant's print with said ridge pattern;

Whereas, Sandor ONLY uses a sensor to read A register line at edge of the substrate.

Sandor DOES NOT describe using a sensory device to FIRST sense the ridge pattern and then to align the print, as the Applicant does. At the step of Sandor's sensory device which reads A register line, Sandor has NOT yet even formed his array of polymer inverse lenticules.

Therefore, the combination of the Magee and Sandor references would NOT yield the Applicant's invention.

In addition to NOT being able to reasonably combine the teaching of Magee with Sandor, in reference to Applicant's claim 5:

The process in the Applicant's cl. 5 is distinctly different from the Sandor process in that the alignment method of the Applicant's claim 5 is NOT in Sandor.

The alignment method of the Applicant's cl. 5 is distinctly different from the Sandor process in that the Applicant embosses ridges in register with "parallel line indicia" of the image, or registration marks, by guiding the film with a sensor that reads the image indicia lines and then embosses a film;

whereas Sandor registers a polymer of inverse lenslets to its printing by means of a sensor reading "A" single register line printed at the edge of the substrate.

In the process of the Applicant's cl. 5, the reading of the actual printed image line indicia to be aligned with their corresponding mutually parallel embossed lenticles, provides an additional level of precision alignment, greater than that provided by Sandor.

Therefore, the combination of the Magee and Sandor references would NOT yield the Applicant's invention.

In addition to NOT being able to reasonably combine the teaching of Magee with Sandor, in reference to Applicant's claim 11:

The process in the Applicant's cl. 11 is distinctly different from the Sandor process in that the alignment method of the Applicant's claim 11 is NOT in Sandor.

Specifically in the process of the Applicant in claim 11, the Applicant FIRST forms light directing portions on a sheet, and subsequently prints parallel imaged strips in alignment with said light directing portions;

whereas the Sandor process FIRST prints and image and A register line, and then aligns inverse lenticules to the printed substrate.

Therefore, the combination of the Magee and Sandor references would NOT yield the Applicant's invention.

In addition to not being able to reasonably combine the teaching of Magee with Sandor, in reference to Applicant's claim 12:

The process in the Applicant's cl. 12 is distinctly different from the Sandor process in that the alignment method of the Applicant's claim 12 is NOT in Sandor.

Sandor FIRST PRINTS his image- then Sandor aligns polymer lenslets to A register line at edge of the substrate using a sensor. The Applicant, in cl.12 FIRST embosses optical ridges into a film, NEXT, relies on a precise cutting of the film edge parallel to said optical ridges; NEXT, uses the edge guide of the printing press to keep the optical ridges parallel to the edge guide so that the subsequent print line indicia in the final step is

printed parallel to the film edge and therefore parallel to the embossed ridges.

Therefore, the combination of the Magee and Sandor references would NOT yield the Applicant's invention.

In addition to not being able to reasonably combine the teaching of Magee with Sandor, in reference to Applicant's claim 13:

The process in the Applicant's cl. 13 is distinctly different from the Sandor process in that the alignment method of the Applicant's claim 13 is NOT in Sandor.

\ Herein, the Applicant cites further specifics of alignment for sheet printing in claim 3: The Applicant states in claim 13: "...cutting the film at right angles,...aligning said sheets by edge guide and gripper guide squarely into the printing press." This results in achieving alignment of print indicia lines parallel to the embossed optical ridges .

Sandor mentions cutting/slitting/trimming the lenticular sheet ONLY after Sandor's roll film has been printed, an alignment step, and the lens applied; NOT as a method of aligning print to to embossed film.

Thereby Sandor's 'cutting/slitting/trimming' is only a generic finishing operation irrelevant to the process of aligning optical ridges to print of the Applicant's claim.

Therefore, the combination of the Magee and Sandor references would NOT yield the Applicant's invention.

In addition to not being able to reasonably combine the teaching of Magee with Sandor, in reference to Applicant's claim 14:

The process in the Applicant's cl. 14 is distinctly different from the Sandor process in that the alignment method of the Applicant's claim 14 is NOT in Sandor.

The Applicant's sensory device senses the ridge pattern; whereas Sandor ONLY senses A register line at edge of the substrate. Sandor DOES NOT describe using a sensory device to sense the ridge pattern to align the print .

Therefore, the combination of the Magee and Sandor references would NOT yield the Applicant's invention.

In addition, in regards to all of the Applicant's claims, the Applicant submits that the prior art lacks any suggestion that the references should be modified in a manner required to meet the claims of the applicant.

Also, the invention of the applicant is classified in a crowded art; and therefore a small step forward should be regarded as significant.

Claim 20 had been objected to in regards to certain of the claim features said not to be found in the specification and or in the drawings.

The Applicant has amended claim 20, such that all the features of the claim are found in the specification and in the drawings, without having to modify the specification or the drawings.

Applicant has amended "B", to read: "C. print cylinders for printing parallel image strips on said transparent sheet." , and has changed the "C" step to "B".

"Print cylinders" appear in the specification in column 17, lines 47-49, and on the drawing, Fig. 21, no. 197.

Spelling of "transparent" has been corrected.

It is noted that the examiner cited additional references on page 5 of the office action. It is not believed any of the references affect the patentability of the present claims.

I therefore believe that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

The Applicant therefore requests reconsideration of the rejection, and allowance of his claims.

As proposed by the examiner, on p.2, no. 2.,of the detailed action, the Applicant requests consideration of being able to include allowable subject matter into nonelected claims.

Request for Constructive Assistance:

If for any reason the claims of this application are not to be in full condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests the constructive assistance and suggestions of the Examiner, in drafting claim language, pursuant to MPEP 707.07(j) or in making constructive suggestions pursuant to MPEP 706.03(d), in order that this application can be placed in allowable condition.

Respectfully submitted,



Bruce A. Rosenthal

Applicant Pto-Se :[phone: 212 254-1028]